

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/819,813	03/29/2001	John Kendrup	003300-763	1138	
7	590 08/13/2003				
	Benton S. Duffett, Jr.			EXAMINER	
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404			PULLIAM, AMY E		
Alexandria, VA	A 22313-1404		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1615	10	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003	16	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/819,8\$	LEUNG ET AL.			
, tavioei, , touei.	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amy E Pulliam	1615			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearmentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of		. 6 . 1 1 1			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened at the content of the shortened at the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriat e fee. The appropriate ex	See MPEP te extension fee tension fee under		
(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	onths after the mailing date of the final reje	ection, even if timely filed,	, may reduce any		
1.⊠ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 July 2003</u> . App- 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		•	th in		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment		
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:	•	sidered but does No	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exan	niner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	•	•			
10 Other	,,, ap = (•),		•		

ŀ



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's assert that their amendments to the claims do not contain limitations which would require further search or consideration. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant contends that each of the limitations that has been incorporated into claim 1 was present at earlier stages in prosecution. Again, the examiner disagrees. For example, Applicant's amendment requires a solubility of less than 50 mg/ml, while previously the claims allowed up to 100 mg/ml. Additionally, the amendment narrows the particle size range to 0.5-100 microns, while the previous claim 3 allowed 0.1 o0 500 microns. Furthermore, asd the claims were drafted before, each of these limitations was present in a claim dependant only from claim 1, and therefore none of the limitations were required simultaneously. The proposed claim includes all of the limitations together in claim 1. Each of these issues certainly requires further search and/ or consideration, and therefore the amendment is improper after final.

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JECHNOLOGY VENTER 1600